

Date: Sat, 19 Feb 94 04:30:12 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #73
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 19 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 73

Today's Topics:

 Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it! (5 msgs)
 Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses) (2 msgs)
 rec.dan.pickersgill.asshole
 rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 17:49:28 EST
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> Well, while it is true that 2 meters has always been the local chat
> band, what I take exception with is the Big Lie(tm) perpetrated upon
> amateur radio by those who pushed through the codeless technician
> license.
>
> The license class was billed as "being for the technical people who
> don't want to do the code", and would "bring loads of new amateurs
> into the ranks who will use some of our underutilized frequency
> spectrum".

>
> Neither of these are true, and people knew the moment that the
> proposal came forth to allow voice communication below 220mhz
> that the license would simply become a loophole for CB transplants
> to gain credibility and impress their friends with the <bleep>
> that automatically comes out of their 'walkie talkie' when
> unkeyed.
>
> This isn't to say that there haven't been many GOOD people who have
> gotten their license and fit the bill according to the intent of the
> codeless license. However, I daresay that based upon my anecdotal
> evidence listening to the local VHF repeaters that these are few and
> far between.
>
> Of course, my impressions could simply be a result of the socioeconomical
> makeup of RI. RI is primarily a blue-collar state where many people do
> not have post high-school (or even a high school) education. I would
> expect that the quality of "codeless" technician in Silicon Valley to
> be immensely higher than what it is in inner-city Providence.
>
> Hmmm. Might make an interesting basis for a sociological study. Guess
> I'd better get to work on getting my research grant!
>

MORE daylight? What are you trying to do Michael, kill .policy?

Seriously, I do not deny that some 'cb transplants' have come into
amateur radio as a result of the codeless license. However, many
ex-cb'ers came to amateur radio BEFORE the codeless license.

To think that some 'users' or 'appliance operators' would not come into
ham radio as a result of the codeless license is silly. Since a great
number of Techs are 'appliance operators'. And were so, before the
advent of the codeless license. I find that many of the hams that have
had tech licenses for a year or two are moving either to digital and
UHF+ bands or are moving to upgrade and use HF.

Aside from that, the 'appliance operator', at least around here, is the
group that contributes most to Public Service. The numbers of operators
that are needed by some of the public service that we do around here can
get to be pretty large. LOTS of those that contribute time are licenses
issued after the codeless license. (I have no way of knowing if they
have code endorsement, as I do not personally know them all that well.)

Dan Pickersgill	N8PKV		Pots have handles,		'Climate is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org			Magazines have personals,		expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu			Hams have names.		what we get.' -L. Long

Date: 18 Feb 1994 07:26:07 -0600
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <ygLXHc13w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
Dan Pickersgill <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:
>xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:
>
>> >Well, it has flooded our spectrum - our 2 meter spectrum. Usage
>> >on other bands has increased minimally. 2 Meters is the bright
>> >spotlight in the middle of a field at night - it attracts all
>> >the bugs.
>>
>> Of course, I predicted this long before that NPRM was passed.
>> The League originally submitted one, which would allow all privileges
>> 222 MHz and above. It seems like that would more accurately fulfill
>> the claim that they will populate underutilized bands in the VHF/UHF
>> spectrum. Oh well...
>>
>
>Now we know why Robert, EXCUSE ME, Mr. Technician! ('Classy name!') sees
>2-meter as being in bad shape. Ans: He predicted it! God forbid that
>'A great x ray technician!' could be WRONG. Better to LIE and be done
>with it...

Why Dan, there's hope for you yet!

--
Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: 18 Feb 1994 07:33:29 -0600
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <X9iXHc9w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
Dan Pickersgill <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:

>md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>
>> The codeless technician license was claimed by many to be the saving
>> grace of amateur spectrum, that it would flood our spectrum with loads
>> of new hams.
>>
>> Well, it has flooded our spectrum - our 2 meter spectrum. Usage
>> on other bands has increased minimally. 2 Meters is the bright
>> spotlight in the middle of a field at night - it attracts all
>> the bugs.
>
>But that comment, less the obvious flame, has been true for a number of
>years (decades?). So what is the point...

The point that Michael is trying to make is that the Codeless Technician was SUPPOSED to be someone who held superior technical and electronics skills, and would advance the state-of-the-radio-art by virtue of their access to our spectrum. They would also help to populate the more underutilized bands in the VHF/UHF allocations.

Of course, what it attracted was a bunch of ex and neo-CBers, who immediately headed straight for Two Meters. I haven't heard a single one on 222, 440, 902, 1240, or any other band for that matter. Oh well...

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 1994 14:02:01 GMT
From: swrinde!sgiblab!brunix!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <X9iXHc9w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

md had said:

|> > Well, it has flooded our spectrum - our 2 meter spectrum. Usage
|> > on other bands has increased minimally. 2 Meters is the bright
|> > spotlight in the middle of a field at night - it attracts all
|> > the bugs.
|>
|> But that comment, less the obvious flame, has been true for a number of
|> years (decades?). So what is the point...

Well, while it is true that 2 meters has always been the local chat band, what I take exception with is the Big Lie(tm) perpetrated upon amateur radio by those who pushed through the codeless technician license.

The license class was billed as "being for the technical people who don't want to do the code", and would "bring loads of new amateurs into the ranks who will use some of our underutilized frequency spectrum".

Neither of these are true, and people knew the moment that the proposal came forth to allow voice communication below 220mhz that the license would simply become a loophole for CB transplants to gain credibility and impress their friends with the <bleep> that automatically comes out of their 'walkie talkie' when unkeyed.

This isn't to say that there haven't been many GOOD people who have gotten their license and fit the bill according to the intent of the codeless license. However, I daresay that based upon my anecdotal evidence listening to the local VHF repeaters that these are few and far between.

Of course, my impressions could simply be a result of the socioeconomical makeup of RI. RI is primarily a blue-collar state where many people do not have post high-school (or even a high school) education. I would expect that the quality of "codeless" technician in Silicon Valley to be immensely higher than what it is in inner-city Providence.

Hmmm. Might make an interesting basis for a sociological study. Guess I'd better get to work on getting my research grant!

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: Thu, 17 Feb 1994 21:15:34 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb17.153537.9683@cs.brown.edu> Michael P. Deignan,

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu writes:

>Well, it has flooded our spectrum - our 2 meter spectrum. Usage
>on other bands has increased minimally. 2 Meters is the bright
>spotlight in the middle of a field at night - it attracts all
>the bugs.

Yep, I been called many things but bugs ain't one of them. As much as you don't want the change, I predict that within the next few years you will see more petitions go before the FCC that deal with the insane requirement of Morse code. The point you missed is that our numbers are growing, and many of us feel the resentment other hams have concerning our license status is unwarranted. Many of us feel that the technical contributions that we could offer the ham community should be considered when upgrading. I am a firm believer in peer pressure, but not in hazing for the fun of it. I have stated before that hazing has a purpose in life, and in the right place it can be beneficial, but ham radio ain't the place.....

So Mr. Deignan, take your cheap shot while you can.....

Rick Aldom

Date: Thu, 17 Feb 1994 16:55:54 GMT

From: newshub.nosc.mil!crash!beacons!kevin@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2jrp5r\$14@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

>Out of the last 80 posts, 33 were authored by Dan Pickersgill.

Well gee, I think at least half a dozen were from Bonnie Freeland. So what?

Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ
kevin@beacons.cts.com

```
-----  
| o o \_/ o o |  
| o o @ o o |  
-----
```

Try Boatanchors
For A Real Lift

Date: Sat, 19 Feb 1994 04:14:23 GMT

From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:

: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: > But all these points tell against the Roman alphabet, do they not?
: > Yet written language is not encryption. Or is it? You neglected to
: > say. Maybe we can agree that morse bears most resemblance to a cipher
: > at 5 wpm, and gradually becomes more like spelling aloud (as opposed
: > to spelling on paper, i.e., writing), or even an aural form of the
: > manual alphabet, when you can copy whole words without having to write
: > it down?

: So morse is slang english? ...

Why the sarcastic response to a conciliatory post?

: ...Is ASCII or EBCDIC? No, it is an encryption
: method that uses (according to this discussion) a wetware modem. Period.

But the question you ignored while merely restating your claim is: Is
writing just the same thing, "an encryption method that uses a wetware
modem?" And furthermore, doesn't that mean you believe mastering
writing to be undesirable for that reason? If not, why not?

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S drt@world.std.com

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 1994 12:27:40 GMT

From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:

: A morse message is encrypted, then sent, then decrypted (by some method,
: wetware or not) to and from english. The fact that it resembles a
: language to be conditioned to encrypt/decrypt it in wetware does not
: make it a language. It, like ASCII, EBCDIC and many other encryption
: methods all do the same thing. Encrypt/decrypt english.

: I have heard many people think that because they were 'talking' in CW to
: a guy in (insert country of choice) that the guy was talking in (insert
: language of country) and not english. If he was using morse, he was

: using english, just encrypting it in morse. One could use RTTY, ASCII,
: EBCDIC or any other method, but it is still english.

: The fact that it requires conditioning to develop proficiency at it does
: not make it a language. Becoming good at an athletic event requires
: conditioning also, that does not make the long jump a language.

But all these points tell against the Roman alphabet, do they not?
Yet written language is not encryption. Or is it? You neglected to
say. Maybe we can agree that morse bears most resemblance to a cipher
at 5 wpm, and gradually becomes more like spelling aloud (as opposed
to spelling on paper, i.e., writing), or even an aural form of the
manual alphabet, when you can copy whole words without having to write
it down?

-drt

Date: 18 Feb 1994 23:33:38 -0600
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!
uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.asshole
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9N8yHc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
Dan Pickersgill <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:
>xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:
>
>> In article <1994Feb18.201459.13423@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
>> Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> wrote:
>> >In article <1994Feb18.140458.28492@cs.brown.edu> Michael P. Deignan,
>> >md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu writes:
>> >>paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>> >>
>> >>> The metric by which posters should be judged is reasonability, not
>> >quantity.
>> >>
>> >>dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) replies:
>> >>
>> >>> Thank you Paul.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>I prefer astronomical units to the metric system myself.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>M "billions and billions of 'code is good' postings" D
>> >

>> >
>> >Michael,
>> > The term "metric" when used this way refers to the procedure or science
>> >used to measure, not the "metric system" as it refers to a lenght of one
>> ^^^^^^
>> >meter. But if you had the background you too could be a clue-less tech.
>>
>> Uh huh.
>
>Don't grunt Robert, EXCUSE me Mr. Technician!, it is impolite and shows
>people how uncivilized you are.

Better to be uncivilized than illiterate. And a damn sight better than
being a Codeless Technician.

--
Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 18:02:27 EST
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>
> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>
> > The metric by which posters should be judged is reasonability, not quantity
>
> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) replies:
>
> > Thank you Paul.
>
>
> I prefer astronomical units to the metric system myself.
>
>
> M "billions and billions of 'code is good' postings" D

How is it the old adage goes? 'Figures don't lie, but liars figure...'

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV | Pots have handles, | 'Climate is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org | Magazines have personals, | expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu | Hams have names. | what we get.' -L. Long

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 23:00:55 EST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@ames.arpa
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

> In article <1994Feb18.201459.13423@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
> Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> wrote:
> >In article <1994Feb18.140458.28492@cs.brown.edu> Michael P. Deignan,
> >md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu writes:
> >>paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> >>
> >>> The metric by which posters should be judged is reasonability, not
> >quantity.
> >>
> >>>dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) replies:
> >>
> >>> Thank you Paul.
> >>
> >>
> >>I prefer astronomical units to the metric system myself.
> >>
> >>
> >>M "billions and billions of 'code is good' postings" D
> >
> >
> >Michael,
> > The term "metric" when used this way refers to the procedure or science
> >used to measure, not the "metric system" as it refers to a lenght of one
> >meter. But if you had the background you too could be a clue-less tech.
> >
> Uh huh.

Don't grunt Robert, EXCUSE me Mr. Technician!, it is impolite and shows
people how uncivilized you are.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV | Pots have handles, | 'Climate is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org | Magazines have personals, | expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu | Hams have names. | what we get.' -L. Long

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 1994 14:04:58 GMT
From: swrinde!sgiblab!brunix!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> The metric by which posters should be judged is reasonability, not quantity.

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) replies:

> Thank you Paul.

I prefer astronomical units to the metric system myself.

M "billions and billions of 'code is good' postings" D
--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: Thu, 17 Feb 1994 21:35:34 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CL95II.M1C@world.std.com>, <CLA7qM.96w@ucdavis.edu>,
<1994Feb17.171021.13553@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: Remote Control OK on 70cm not on 2m?

Robert H.B. Netzer (rn@cs.brown.edu) wrote:

: This is the problem: to ID the other side of the cross-band repeater as
: you suggest (the side that is repeating the repeater output), your HT has
: to transmit on the repeater output, intentionally causing interference
: to those in the area who are listening on that frequency.
I don't understand. I am not suggesting that you id whole someone else is
xmitting on the repeater input. I assumed that one would only ID when

the freq was clear. If you are implying that there is a problem with transmitting on an empty frequency that happens to have a repeater output I can't see that as a problem. I would feel comfortable transmitting on the squelch tail as well, but that may be up for debate. What does the net think is transmitting on the tail of a repeater intentional interference?

: Unfortunately, it seems that when rigs with cross-band repeating are
: used for this application (as a "range extender" for an HT to monitor a
: conventional repeater), there's no way to comply with the FCC regs: you
: either end up not IDing one side of the cross-band repeater, or you end
: up causing interference on the (conventional) repeater output.

Again you are only interfering if you transmit over the top of the repeater.

: The best I've been able to do is to use only one side of the cross-band repeat
: feature as a "transmit range extender" for my HT. Usually I can hear the
repeater
: output just fine, but I can't make it to the repeater from inside a grocery
store,
That's fine but only works when the HT transmits in or above the 220 MHz,
band otherwise you would still have to switch bands to control the
mobile.

cheers,
Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*   The only thing I can officially say for the University is:  *
*   What I say is in no way related to official University policy *
*-----*
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #73

